

RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER  
FEB 12 2009

Hang Liu  
553 Tidewater Pl  
Waterloo, ON, N2V 2S2  
Canada

Feb. 12, 2009

Commissioner of Patents  
Attn. Binh K. Tieu  
Primary Examiner  
Technology Division 2614  
Washington, D.C. 20231  
U.S.A.

Fax to: 571 273 8300

Dear Binh K. Tieu, or other examiner(s):

This communication is to respond to the "Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment" mailed to me on Jan. 14, 2009 regarding 10/609,364 (Method and system for determining a location of a wireless transmitting device and guiding the search for the same). I have enclosed the amended claim list with ONLY format changes for compliance with 37 CFR 1.121, for your examination, with following notes (many of them are still re-responding to the previous office action mailed on Jan. 8, 2008, however, referenced to the newly format-changed claim numbers in the amendments):

1. Upon your request in paragraph 1 (of office action mailed on Jan. 8, 2008) for an affirmation of my election made, I reconfirm that my election was to examine claims 1 through 47. The claim 48 has been withdrawn from the amended claim list as enclosed in this communication.
2. Thank you for allowing claims 15 through 36, and they stay as they were in the enclosed amended claim list.
3. The Claim 1 is withdrawn.
4. The claim 5 that you determined conditionally allowable in paragraph 4 of the "Detailed Action" (of office action mailed on Jan. 8, 2008) has been rewritten in an independent form in the amended claim list, which included the key steps in the previous claim 5, while some detailed features of the previous claim 5 were

moved into a new dependent claim (the new claim 49) that is dependent upon the amended claim 5. Please examine them.

5. The rejected dependent claims (claims 2, 3 and 4) now are dependent on the amended claim 5, which is the independent form of the conditionally allowable ex-claim 5 that you had determined, I feel the dependent claims 2, 3 and 4 may be reexamined given that the amended claim 5 might be allowable.
6. The conditionally allowable claims 6-7 and 9-10 that you had determined stay as they were, which are now dependent on the rewritten independent form of claim 5.
7. The conditionally allowable claims 8, now dependent on the rewritten independent form of claim 5 only had some minor wording change.
8. The conditionally allowable claim 11 that you had determined is now rewritten in an independent form. Please consider allowing it.
9. The conditionally allowable claim 12 that you had determined is now rewritten in an independent form. Please consider allowing it.
10. Claim 13 is withdrawn.
11. The claim 14 is now amended to be dependent on the rewritten independent form of claim 12 which you indicated might be conditionally allowable. Please reexamine it with the independent form of claim 12.
12. Regarding rejected claims 37 and 41, I found the reference documents do not teach a movable detection station that is workable with a reference wireless transmitting device or a handheld guiding device that may be used by a rescuer, further more, the "MBS 148" in the reference document US-2004/0266457 does not teach performing the features in the conditionally allowable claims 5-12 and allowed claims 15-36, such as, refining the position estimation based on quality of data, working with a guiding device and refining the guidance to the rescuer for searching the target by taking advantage of the reference wireless transmitting device using relative measurements, and by providing relative positioning information to the rescuer, etc.. Therefore, the claims 37 and 41 were amended (and merged) into the currently amended claim 37 to include these features, for your examination. The Claim 41 is withdrawn.